

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-13, 15-17 and 19-47 are now present in the application. The specification, abstract, and claims 1-5, 15-17, 19, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31, 35 and 37 have been amended. Claims 41-47 have been added. Claim 14 has been withdrawn and hereby cancelled. Claim 18 has also been cancelled. Claims 1, 15, 31 and 35, 46 and 47 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that

1. Claims 1-13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph;
2. Claims 16, 18-23, 26-30, 32 and 33 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims; and
3. Claims 38 and 39 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants greatly appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

By the present amendment, independent claims 46 and 47 have been added to include the subject matter of dependent claims 16 and 19, respectively, which were indicated by the Examiner as including allowable subject matter. Accordingly, it is believed that independent claims 46 and 47 are in condition for allowance.

In addition, in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks hereinbelow, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph has been overcome, as discussed hereinbelow. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 1-13 are in condition for allowance.

Restriction/Election

The Examiner has acknowledged Applicants' restriction and has made the restriction requirement final to withdraw claim 14 from further consideration. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 has been cancelled.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. §119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on November 10, 2004 and December 30, 2004, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form filed therewith.

Drawings

Applicants thank the Examiner for accepting the formal drawings of the instant application.

Specification Objections

The specification and the abstract have been objected to due to the presence of minor informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this objection has been addressed. A Substitute Specification is attached hereto. This statement is included in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.125 to indicate that it is the undersigned's belief that no new matter has been included in the Substitute Specification and Abstract.

A comparison version of the specification is provided. This comparison document indicates all additions and deletions to the originally filed specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the Substitute Specification includes the same changes as are indicated in the comparison document which compares the originally filed specification to the amended specification or Substitute Specification.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-13, 15-34 and 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been addressed. Accordingly, all pending claims are now definite and clear. Reconsideration

and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 15, 17, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka, U.S. Patent No. 4,096,369. Claims 31, 34-37 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Valle, U.S. Patent No. 5,918,589. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Claim 15

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Without conceding to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance the prosecution of the application, as the Examiner will note, independent claim 15 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including "the at least one air outlet hole facing a discharging side of the fan". Support for the above combination of elements can be found in FIGs. 4-6 and 9 of the instant application. Applicants respectfully submit that the above combination of elements set forth in amended independent claim 15 is not disclosed or suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

Tanaka discloses a microwave oven including a cooling fan 30, perforations 29, and an exhaust guide 32 at the back side of the oven 1 (see FIG. 2). As shown in FIG. 2 of Tanaka, the

fan 30 discharges the air at its left-top side to the channel between the body 1 and the plate 20. The air in the channel is blocked by the metal close to the perforations 31 and then enters into the perforations 31. However, Tanaka fails to teach any air outlet hole facing the discharging side of the fan 30 to exhaust the air in the channel. The exhaust guide 32 is at the backside of the oven 1 and does not face the discharging side of the fan 30, either. Accordingly, Tanaka fails to teach “the at least one air outlet hole facing a discharging side of the fan”.

In addition, since the metal close to the perforations 31 blocks the air in the channel, it would cause air turbulence around the perforations 31. This would make the air more difficult to be exhausted. Unlike Tanaka’s ineffective design, the present invention provides an air outlet hole facing a discharging side of the fan to effectively exhaust the air. This feature is not shown in Tanaka.

Since Tanaka fails to teach each and every recitation of amended independent claim 15, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 15 is not anticipated by Tanaka.

In addition, claims 17, 24 and 25 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 15, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claim 15, which is believed to be allowable.

Claims 31 and 35

Independent claim 31 recites a combination of elements including “an air inlet hole in one side of a door frame for introduction of air discharged from the electric oven”. Independent claim 35 recites a combination of elements including “an air inlet hole in one side of a door frame for introduction of air discharged by the fan”. Applicants respectfully submit that the

combinations of elements set forth in independent claims 31 and 35 are not disclosed or suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

Valle discloses an oven ventilation system including a door 18 having openings 64 at the bottom of the door 18 to introduce the exterior air into the door, and slots 22 at the top of the door 18 to direct the introduced air out to keep the exterior of the door 18 cooler. However, Valle fails to teach that the openings 64 introduce the air discharged from the electric oven or discharged by the fan. Therefore, Valle fails to teach “an air inlet hole in one side of a door frame for introduction of air discharged from the electric oven” as recited in independent claim 31 and “an air inlet hole in one side of a door frame for introduction of air discharged by the fan” as recited in independent claim 35.

Since Valle fails to teach each and every recitation of independent claims 31 and 35, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 31 and 35 are not anticipated by Valle.

In addition, claims 34, 36, 37 and 40 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 31 and 35, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claims 31 and 35, which are believed to be allowable.

In view of the above amendments to the claims and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15, 17, 24, 25, 31, 34-37 and 40 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

In addition to independent claims 46 and 47, additional claims 41-45 have been added for the Examiner's consideration.

Dependent claims 41 recites "the air is drawn through the at least one air inlet hole and discharged through the at least one air outlet hole without passing through the inner case". As shown in FIG. 2 of Tanaka, the air pass through the heating cavity 3 within the inner case 2 before exhausted to the exterior. Therefore, Tanaka fails to teach the above recitation of claim 41.

Dependent claims 42 and 44 recite "the outer case defining a front surface of the electric oven, the air inlet hole being located inside the front surface of the electric oven". As shown in FIG. 2 of Valle, neither the openings 64 nor the slots 22 are within a front surface of the oven enclosure 56. In fact, the door 18 including the openings 64 and the slots 22 protrudes from the front surface of the oven enclosure 56. Therefore, Valle fails to teach the above recitation of claims 42 and 44.

Dependent claims 43 and 45 recite "the air inlet hole is slanted toward the electric oven to facilitate the introduction of the air discharged from the electric oven". As shown in FIG. 2 of Valle, neither the openings 64 nor the slots 22 are slanted toward the electric oven. In fact, both the openings 64 and the slots 22 face directly upward and downward. Therefore, Valle fails to teach the above recitation of claims 43 and 45.

Favorable consideration and allowance of additional claims 41-47 are respectfully requested.

Additional Cited References

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but rather to merely show the state of the art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No.:10/733,399
Art Unit: 3742

Attorney Docket No. 0465-1079P
Amendment dated August 25, 2005
Page 22

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther Chong #40,953
James T. Eller, Jr.
Reg. No. 39,538

JTE/GH/jg

ENO

P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000